

Appl. No.: 09/807,143  
Amdt. Dated: December 3, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of: September 24, 2003

PATENT AF  
RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1116  
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE  
EXAMINING GROUP 2643

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action, and it is respectfully submitted that the application as amended, is patentable over the art of record. Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 7, and 12 have been amended. Claim 13 has been added.

Claim 7 is objected to. Claim 7 has been amended to correct the informality.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Irube et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,377,818 B2). Claim 12 has been amended to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. For the following reasons, the Examiners' rejection is respectfully traversed.

Irube does not disclose "rotating means for generating said transmit picture signal by rotating the orientation of an image picked up by said image pick-up means" as recited in claim 12. In Irube, the orientation of a local video telephone is compared with the orientation of a second communicating distant video telephone, and if the orientation of the two telephones is different, then a controller processes a display image to match the video display directions of the telephones. However, Irube does not generate a transmit picture signal by rotating the orientation of the image picked up by the image pick-up means. Therefore, Irube does not teach all the elements of the claimed invention.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irube in view of Tamura et al. (JP 11196397A). Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly and particularly

describe the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. For the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

None of the references disclose or suggest "rotating means for rotating the orientation of an image of said transmit picture signal" as recited in claim 1. Irube is cited as disclosing these elements (Office action 09/24/2003, page 4). As mentioned previously for claim 12, the Irube controller processes a display image to match the video display directions when the two video telephone have conflicting orientations. However, Irube does not disclose or suggest rotating the orientation of an image of a transmit picture signal. Therefore, even if combined, the references do not disclose or suggest all the elements of the claimed invention.

With regard to the rejection of claim 2, none of the references disclose or suggest "image pick-up direction detector means for detecting the vertical direction of said image pick-up means" as recited in claim 2. Irube is cited for discloses these elements (Office Action 09/24/2003, page 5). Irube discloses a camera unit 4 and a camera direction sensor unit 28 (col. 6, lines 8-17; Fig. 1). The Irube camera direction sensor unit 28 detects the presence or absence of the camera 4 and if the camera is facing in the same direction (i.e., same side) or opposite direction (i.e., back side) as the display surface of the video LCD. Therefore, the Irube camera direction sensor unit 28 does not detect the vertical direction of the display means. Thus, Irube does not disclose or suggest image pick-up direction detector means for detecting the vertical direction of the image pick-up means. Thus, even if combined, the references do not disclose or suggest all the elements of the claimed invention.

Appl. No.: 09/807,143  
Arndt. Dated: December 3, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of: September 24, 2003

PATENT AF  
RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1116  
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE  
EXAMINING GROUP 2643

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 33483.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: Suzanne B. Gagnon  
Suzanne B. Gagnon, Reg. No. 48924

1801 East 9th Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

Date: December 3, 2003